

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been amended to recite a feature recited in claim 1. More specifically, claim 11 has been amended to include the feature whereby the speech user interface subsystem presents one of said plurality of profiles containing the user-defined functions.

The Examiner's specific rejections will now be addressed.

Rejections to claims 1-2, 4-16 and 18-20 under 35 USC 102(b)

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 6 and 11 as being anticipated by International Publication WO 99/14928 (Braman). Applicant has reviewed the Examiner's reasoning in the prior Office Action dated February 9, 2006, and Response to Arguments on page 5 of the present Office Action.

The Examiner alleges that Braman is identical in all material aspects to the claimed invention, and differs only in terminology. More specifically, the Examiner appears to equate the term "function" recited in the claims with the term "string" described in Braman. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that the definition of "function" recited in the present application is necessarily different than the functional definition of the "string" in Braman. While both accomplish some form of function or operation, such a definition is overly broad, and should be contextualized or limited by the application it is used within.

The context of the present application is as follows. The invention recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 11 is directed to a method and system for customizing a speech based user interface. As clearly taught by the specification at page 1, lines 19-21, a speech based user interface is a means for an application to communicate information to the user in spoken words, and a means for a user to input commands to the system through spoken words. The speech based user interface prompts the user for input by presenting available functions, as stated at page 1, lines 33-34, and can provide information in response to a user command. It is the desired result of the claimed invention to modify and change the way in which the user interface presents information to the user. The description at page 8, lines 18-30 provides examples of the desired result of the claimed invention, whereby personalized rules or functions can be applied to data in order to restrict the data being presented to the

user. In fact, the pre-amble of claims 1 and 6 set the context of the claimed invention by reciting a method for customizing or using a customized speech based user interface. Nowhere does the applicant seek to modify or execute functions for gaining access to the information system (ie. voicemail system). Therefore, taking the specification as a whole, the "user-defined functions" should be limited to those functions which modify the speech based user-interface itself and manipulate the data to be presented to the user.

The context of Braman is as follows. Braman is directed to a system for automating telephone access to an information system, such as a voice mail system, using touch tone data previously and manually entered by the user. More specifically, the Braman system records a manual transaction, called the "string", between a user and the system he wishes to access. The "string" includes menu selections and security codes for accessing the system. The name or number for which the manual transaction was necessary then becomes a "short-cut", as the Braman system will automatically execute the stored "string" when the user accesses the same name or number again. The Braman "string" dials, authenticates and plays voice mail messages, which any person skilled in the art would characterize as system access functions, as they serve no other purpose than to gain entry to the voice mail system for playing back a message. As such, the Braman "string" is nothing more than data associated with a name or number, and in no way can be considered functional information for manipulating the user-interface. Hence the Braman "string" does not change the way the speech based user interface presents information to the user. While the Braman access system is used in conjunction with a speech based user interface, Braman never infers that his speech based user interface can be changed, and instead teaches that a fixed speech based user interface system is used. Page 1, lines 34-36 of Braman states that *"Pre-recorded instructional messages are stored in the memory of the call processing subsystem for instructing a user on his or her progress in using the system."* This infers that the speech based user interface of Braman is not customizable by the user, since only the system administrator can modify these messages to correspond with any change in the user interface function.

Therefore, Applicant submits that given the context of the presently claimed invention, any person skilled in the art would understand that the feature "user-defined functions" refers to those functions which include modifying the speech based user-interface

itself and manipulating the data to be presented to the user, while excluding system access functions. Accordingly, since the Braman system is specifically directed to implementing system access functions, there is clearly no overlap between the teachings of Braman and the presently claimed subject matter.

Therefore, Braman fails to disclose or teach the customization of user-defined functions for a speech based user interface, and the provision of said customized functions to the user through the user interface (via the profile), as recited in claims 1, 6 and 11. Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections to claims 1, 6 and 11, and their respective dependent claims, under 35 USC 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejections to claims 3 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 17 as being obvious in view of Braman and U.S. Patent No. 6,487,277 (Beyda). Claims 3 and 17 depend indirectly from claim 1, which the Applicant has previously argued is novel in view of Braman. In view of the novelty of claim 1 over Braman, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 17 are unobvious in view of the combination of Braman and Beyda. Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection to claims 3 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

We believe no fee is required. However, if a fee is due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and favorable action to that end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

INVENTORS GO HERE

By: /Shin Hung/
Shin Hung
Reg. No. 55,497
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
World Exchange Plaza
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9
CANADA
Tel: (613) 237-5160
Fax: (613) 787-3558
E-mail: ipinfo@blgcanada.com

SHH/dbm